

1-1-1990

# Effective Practices Currently Used By Classroom Teachers To Facilitate Mainstreaming

Nicole M. Elsie

*Eastern Illinois University*

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Special Education](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

---

## Recommended Citation

Elsie, Nicole M., "Effective Practices Currently Used By Classroom Teachers To Facilitate Mainstreaming" (1990). *Masters Theses*. 672. <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/672>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

LB  
1861  
.C57x  
E38  
1990  
E4  
copy 2

EFFECTIVE PRACTICES CURRENTLY USED  
BY CLASSROOM TEACHERS TO FACILITATE  
MAINSTREAMING

ELSIE

# THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

5-15-90

Date

Nicole Elsie

Author

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date

Author

Effective Practices Currently Used by Classroom

Teachers to Facilitate Mainstreaming

(TITLE)

BY

Nicole M. Elsie

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
Master of Science in Education

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1990

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

5-14-90

DATE

*Janet J. Swanie*  
ADVISER

5/11/90

DATE

*Kathlene S. Shank*  
DEPARTMENT HEAD

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE.....	
TITLE PAGE.....	1
ABSTRACT.....	2
DEDICATION.....	
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	
INTRODUCTION.....	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	4
PURPOSE OF STUDY.....	16
METHOD.....	17
ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	18
RESULTS.....	19
DISCUSSION.....	22
REFERENCES.....	26
TABLES.....	33
TABLE 1.....	A
TABLE 2.....	B
TABLE 3.....	C
TABLE 4.....	D
TABLE 5.....	E
TABLE 6.....	F
TABLE 7.....	G
APPENDICES.....	34
MAINSTREAMING SURVEY.....	A

Masters Thesis:  
Effective Practices Currently Used by  
Classroom Teachers to Facilitate Mainstreaming  
Nicole M. Elsie  
Eastern Illinois University

## Abstract

Nine effective practices used most commonly in mainstreaming a child with a learning/behavior problem were identified through the literature. Regular educators were surveyed to determine the frequency of use of each of the nine practices identified (peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring, task analysis, parent volunteers, curriculum modification, mastery learning, cooperative learning, study skills, and classroom behavior). The frequency of use of the nine effective mainstreaming practices by classroom teachers was compared using a chi-square analysis ( $p < .05$ ) based on four independent variables (workshop attendance, grade levels taught, years of teaching experience, and the year the last degree was obtained). Significant differences were found in seven of 36 analyses. Educators who had attended workshops used curriculum modification ( $p < .0009$ ), cooperative learning ( $p < .0229$ ), and study skills ( $p < .0025$ ) significantly more often than educators who had not attended workshops. Elementary teachers used behavior management techniques ( $p < .0000$ ) and cooperative learning ( $p < .0055$ ) significantly more often than middle and high school teachers. High school teachers used parent volunteers significantly ( $p < .0472$ ) more often than middle and

elementary teachers. Teachers who obtained their last degree prior to 1983 used cooperative learning significantly ( $p < .0408$ ) more often than teachers who obtained their degrees in or after 1983. Implications for the training of teachers, both preservice and inservice, were identified.



## DEDICATION

This paper is lovingly dedicated to my children, Richard Wayburn Elsie III and Kathryn Elizabeth Elsie, and my husband, Richard, Jr. I thank them for giving up their time with their mother and wife. I hope they understand the significance of this accomplishment in the future. A big thank you goes to my parents, Elizabeth and Larry Metzelaars and Ray and Kathy Quinn; and to my husband's parents, Richard and Verda Elsie, for all the support they gave while I was working toward my master's degree and while writing this paper. I wish the best to my sisters, Cheryl Schmits and Liesle Quinn, in their educational pursuits. I give my deepest thanks to my friend, Tammy Ballard, for all those teleconferences. Finally, to my friend, Alicia Westjohn, who turned working on a master's degree into an entertaining experience: WE DID IT!

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to recognize the members of my thesis committee for all they have done to make this study a reality. To Dr. Ron Gholson, thank you for your valuable input and suggestions. I was enlightened by your wonderful sense of humor.

To Dr. Andrew Brulle, thank you for sharing your insight on research statistics and knowledge of mainstreaming literature. Also, thank you for your calm reassurance that our work would eventually materialize.

To Dr. Judith Ivarie, my committee chairman, thank you for the enormous amount of time you gave in order for me to finish this thesis in time for a Spring 1990 diploma. The long hours definitely paid off. Your expertise is complimented by your charm and grace.

I am grateful for the assistance of my committee. You are all highly appreciated.

### Introduction

Ever since the implementation of Public Law 94-142 mainstreaming, although never named as such in PL 94-142, has become a vital part of today's education system. Mainstreaming, as used in this study, is defined as "to place (as a handicapped child) in regular school classes" (Webster's, 1985). Sapon-Shevin (1979) reported a considerable amount of resistance to mainstreaming from the community. This resistance has often been linked with a lack of understanding of mainstreaming. Quite often teachers have developed similar negative attitudes to mainstreaming. Attitudes become less positive with ascending grade levels (Larrivee & Cook, 1979). Fear and anxiety (Solomon, 1977) and perception of own competence (Larrivee & Cook, 1979) are among the influential factors that formulate attitudes. These attitudes have been researched in every level of teaching from preservice (Sesow & Adams; 1982, Warger & Tripe, 1982) to inservice (Schmelkin, 1981; Coleman & Gilliam, 1983; Knoff, 1985; Wood & Seyfarth, 1985).

### Review of Literature

Preservice research indicated that student teachers need realistic training opportunities with students who are mainstreamed to experience strategies

vital to mainstreaming. (Sesow & Adams, 1982; Warger & Tripe, 1982). Likewise, inservice research indicated that teachers attitudes are such that they need to be altered in order to more effectively serve the population that is mainstreamed (Knoff, 1985; Wood & Seyfarth, 1985). Many attempts have been made at modifying teachers attitudes toward mainstreaming (Lombana, 1980; Kunzweiler, 1982; Leyser & Abrams, 1984; McDaniel, 1982). Research indicated that attitudes may be more positive if teachers have training or experience with children with disabilities (Sesow & Adams, G., 1982). Martin (1986) discussed the need of special and regular education to work together instead of from opposite ends. He also gives suggestions to aid in this process. Through a review of the literature, Martin (1986) maintained educators can obtain a treasury of effective mainstreaming practices. These practices include workshops or inservices, peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring, task analysis, parent volunteers, curriculum modification, mastery learning, cooperative learning, study skills, and classroom behavior. Each of these practices are described in more detail here.

Workshops or inservices

Inservice is defined as "going on or continuing [training] while one is fully employed (as in teacher education workshops)" (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1985, p. 625). Larrivee (1981) found that teachers tend to be accepting of children labeled as exceptional if support from other personnel is provided. Ninety-five percent of teachers receiving concentrated training agreed or strongly agreed that children with special needs should be given every opportunity to function in the regular classroom setting where possible. Inservices that provided continuous feedback and supportive assistance of the trainer contributed significantly to the success of the intensive inservice training model (p. 38).

Allan (1982) suggested four workshops to prepare regular teachers for mainstreaming. These were titled as follows: (a) teacher's attitudes and beliefs about mainstreaming, (b) preparation of the regular class about mainstreaming, (c) handicapped pupils, and d) entrance into the regular class (p. 193-198). These four workshops are to be presented by a counselor so teachers will be made more aware of critical areas and are provided the skills to handle them (p. 200). Lombardi, Meadowcraft and Strasburger (1982) suggested

that teacher trainers' attitudes toward mainstreaming can be modified through use of a series of workshops emphasizing sensitivity. Technical assistance for course modifications was also available as part of the workshops. Hutchinson and Haring (1982) proposed that special educators be trained via inservice programs to become effective consultants for regular educators. Gans (1987) suggested that inservice programs be built in to the daily routines of a teacher's day because "they emphasize day-to-day procedures more than off-the-job in-service programs" (p. 44).

#### Peer tutoring

Peer tutoring was described as the use of same-age classmates in one-on-one tutoring (Jenkins & Jenkins, 1985). Support for increasing the use of peer tutors to assist in the [regular] classroom was proposed by Hutchinson and Haring, (1982). This was supported by other research (Darrow, 1990). Asselin (1983) established a peer tutoring inservice program to study the effects of peer tutoring on home economics teachers' knowledge and attitudes. Asselin stated that the use of peer tutors will influence successful integration of students with handicapping conditions in the regular classroom. By utilizing peer tutors, the teacher's influence is extended and permits

individualized instruction. Students with handicapping conditions perform at a substantially higher academic rate using peer tutoring than from other instructional techniques, such as teacher-directed instruction, small group instruction, or counseling. The content for each of the peer-tutoring workshops was developed from a review of the literature. The three topics most frequently included were procedures for establishing a peer-tutoring program, specific tutoring skills, and activities for training peer tutors. The results suggested that the inservice program contributed significantly to the increase of home economics teachers' knowledge of procedures for using peer tutors, or the buddy system (p. 356). Based upon these findings, the peer tutoring inservice program was an effective means of increasing home economics teachers' knowledge of procedures for using peer tutors.

In an in-service training established to change attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming, Leyser and Abrams (1984) conducted inservices for regular classroom teachers. Each teacher participating in the inservice identified a problem of one or more students and implemented (in their classrooms) an intervention strategy. Some teachers chose peer

tutoring to implement in math, writing, and reading classes.

Mason (1985) suggested deliberately teaming up special and regular students who are working on similar skills. Sarkees and Sullivan (1985) included the buddy system (peer tutoring) as one of twenty-five tips for vocational student organization (VSO) advisers.

Reisberg and Wolf (1988) suggested that peer tutoring could be an effective student-focused intervention if classmates are "used as scribes and readers for students with handicapping conditions in the regular classroom" (p. 36).

#### Cross-age tutoring

Cross-age tutoring, the use of tutors not the same age as the tutee, has proven to be successful in leading to skill improvement (Jenkins & Jenkins, 1985). Hutchinson and Haring (1982) suggest increasing the use of cross-age tutors to assist in the classroom which may reduce the number of specialists who work with the majority of students with handicapping conditions (p. 86). As in their suggestion for peer tutoring, Reisberg and Wolf (1988) also suggest cross-age tutoring to achieve similar results (p. 36). When using cross-age tutors, tutors are provided training with a set of instructional sequences or routines.



High performance gains have been yielded using cross-age tutors using (Jenkins & Jenkins, 1981).

### Task analysis

O'Brien (1985) suggested that teachers need to task analyze academics. O'Brien (1985) suggested that task analysis is an effective mainstreaming practice. Task analysis is breaking instructional tasks into small steps. For example, a task viewed as a one-step operation may have 50 steps that must be taught before a student can master the task. O'Brien (1985) found that task analysis helped students labeled as handicapped to succeed. Cassidy (1990) also supported the use of task analysis with students who are mainstreamed.

### Parent volunteers

Hutchinson and Haring (1982) suggested obtaining parent volunteers to assist in the classroom. They also stated that parent volunteers could reduce the number of specialists who work with students with special needs. Darrow (1990) supported the use of parent volunteers.

### Curriculum modification

Curriculum modification is the changing of curriculum to meet the specific needs of learners with handicapping conditions. Curriculum modification is an

effective practice when mainstreaming students in regular music classes (Cassidy, 1990). Hock, Hasazi, and Patton (1990) stated curriculum modification as an effective mainstreaming practice. Kunzweiler (1982) questioned the benefit of mainstreaming without using an individualized curriculum-instruction approach. Leyser and Abrams (1984) recommended the use of inservice training series in which participants developed and implemented intervention strategies, such as modifying materials.

Specific curriculum modification techniques have been suggested. Mason (1985) suggested presenting concepts through three senses: sight, sound, and touch. Sarkees and Sullivan (1985) suggested rewriting material in a simplified format and putting material into a motto or creed form to aid memorization. Reisburg and Wolf (1988) suggested curriculum modification as an effective intervention focusing on the student.

#### Mastery learning

Mastery learning is a set of procedures that provides specific and direct feedback to mildly handicapped students in a mainstream setting (Bloom, 1984; Guskey, 1984). Specific instructional units based upon specific goals and objectives are developed

by the classroom teacher. Preconceived criteria is established for student performance evaluation. Those students failing to meet the established criterion are given specific feedback and correctives such as reteaching, alternative texts or materials, workbooks, games, study groups, tutoring, learning kits, learning centers, or computer-assisted instruction (Guskey, 1984). Reisburg and Wolf (1988) showed mastery learning to be an effective intervention focusing on the student as it incorporated specified practices to benefit many students, assisted students with handicapping conditions to remain in the general class, and provided general education teachers with a set of easily implemented procedures.

#### Cooperative learning

Cooperative learning groups focus upon two goals: accelerating academic achievement and assisting social integration of students with handicaps within regular class settings (Slavin, Sharan, Kagan, Hertz-Lazarowitz, Webb, & Schmuck, 1985). Cooperative learning models seemed to be effective with all types of learning tasks, but they appeared to be most effective on those tasks that require high degrees of conceptual learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1984). According to Reisburg and Wolf (1988), cooperative

learning provided students with more practice opportunities and promoted active participation and increased academic engagement, although it required intensive commitment on the part of the consultant and the classroom teacher.

### Study skills

Study habits are a significant concern for mildly handicapped students. Reisburg and Wolf (1988) suggested that these habits need to be assessed and that strategies need to be developed to address study skill deficits.

### Classroom Behavior

Classroom behavior is the way a student behaves in a classroom. Cassidy (1990) suggested establishing behavioral expectations and teaching strategies to students with handicaps for regular music classrooms. Through a series of workshops, Leyser and Abrams (1984) had participating teachers develop and implement specific mainstreaming strategies. These strategies included the classroom behavior strategy and substrategies (e.g., token economies, self-charting, ignoring and time out) to reduce undesirable behaviors. Mason (1985) suggested using assertive discipline and a private time out area for developing desirable behaviors. Reisburg and Wolf (1988) state that the use

of self-evaluation or self-recording techniques on attention-to-task activities alleviates a major concern for educators when mainstreaming students.

### Regular Education Initiative

If we do not tear the walls down between regular and special education teacher training, it is doubtful that the quality of the interaction between teacher and mainstreamed student will improve (Kunzweiler, 1982). Special and regular educators need to be pursuing similar goals in mainstreaming. The Regular Education Initiative (REI), suggested by Will (1986) is a plan to adapt the regular classroom to make it possible for the student to learn in that environment. She challenged regular educators and special educators to "form a partnership and blend the intrinsic strengths of both systems" (p. 12). There is no consensus on the REI issue (Davis, 1989). Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel (1988) give five arguments against REI: (a) Students are not overidentified for special education and there is not a widening gap between regular and special education, (b) student failure is not solely placed on teacher shortcomings, (c) teacher competency doesn't necessarily equal a positive attitude, (d) increase in student variability may mean low performing students become more obvious, and (e) mean performance is

measured against minimal group variance. Schumaker & Deshler (1988) listed three barriers to implementation of REI on a secondary level: (a) gap in skill level and demands in secondary classrooms, (b) intensive instruction required to overcome skill/strategy deficits, and (c) structural limitations, such that teacher-centered (instruction) would have to change to student-centered instruction.

Others are not so pessimistic, they call for more research before launching this "new" approach to education (Bryan, Bay, & Donahue, 1988; Hallahan, Keller, McKinney, Lloyd, & Bryan, 1988; Keogh, 1988; McKinney & Hocutt, 1988). Still others are in favor of implementing REI strategy in an effort to form the necessary partnership between regular and special education to develop solutions to current education problems (Korimek & Laycock, 1988; Sapon-Shevin, 1988; Trent, 1989). By identifying and utilizing effective mainstreaming practices, special and regular educators can work better together to successfully mainstream students with handicapping conditions (Sapon-Shevin, 1988; Trent, 1989). Special educators can assist the regular class teacher through advance preparation which will help the regular teacher feel as though she is not being forced to fit their style into some specific

mold. Although special educators cannot actually implement the mainstreaming practice, they can study the effectiveness of each practice, consult with the regular educator, and assist in preparation of materials the regular class educator needs to help students be successful in the regular class.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine which of these effective practices are most commonly used by regular educators in mainstreaming a child with a learning/behavior problem. The results of this study provide implications for preservice and inservice training. Survey research has been found effective in describing teaching practices (Borg & Gall, 1989). Survey research was used to answer the following research questions:

1. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the attendance of workshops?
2. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the grade level taught?
3. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the amount of teaching experience?

4. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the year the last degree was obtained?

### Method

#### Subjects

The subjects for the survey were regular educators in a rural midwestern special education cooperative. A systematic, stratified sampling procedure was used in selecting the sample population (n=297). Every tenth name was chosen until thirty percent of the total population (n=983) was listed. Stratification variables considered included: grade levels taught (1-4, 5-8, 9-12), and sex of teachers (male, female).

#### Design

A survey was developed to determine which practices are being used and/or recommended by regular educators and special educators. A survey is one of the best tools for obtaining current teaching methods and provides usable data for the problem question at hand (Borg & Gall, 1989).

#### Instrument

A survey was developed which contained two sections. Section I contained the demographic information. Section II contained a listing of the



nine effective practices indicated in the literature review. These practices were listed on a Likert-type scale which allowed respondents to indicate their use of each practice. Prior to the study, the survey was piloted in a rural midwestern middle school to ensure its conciseness and thoroughness.

### Procedure

The surveys, along with cover letters, were mailed approximately the last week in February, 1990. Each survey and cover letter was sent with a self-addressed, stamped envelope and a statement that results would be mailed to subjects if they chose to have them sent as an incentive for returning the survey. Data from the returned surveys (69.7% return rate) was analyzed to determine the frequency with which each of the nine practices were currently being used by regular educators in the mainstreaming of individuals with learning/behavior problems.

### Analysis of Data

Data from the returned surveys was analyzed using a chi-square analysis ( $p < .05$ ). A chi-square test is an effective analysis when determining "whether frequency distributions differ significantly from each other" (Borg & Gall, 1989, p. 356). The frequency of use of each of the nine mainstreaming practices was analyzed

based on each of the four independent variables (workshop attendance, grade level taught, years of teaching experience, and year last degree was obtained).

### Results

Nearly 70% of the surveys were returned within four weeks. The analysis was based on these data. The chi-square analyses found seven significant results at the  $p < .05$  level. Workshop attendance, grade level taught, and years last degree was obtained were all significantly related to one or more of the mainstreaming practices. Educators who had attended workshops used curriculum modification significantly ( $p < .0009$ ) more often than did those educators who had not attended workshops (Table 1). Teachers who had attended workshops used cooperative learning significantly ( $p < .0229$ ) more often than those teachers who had not attended workshops (Table 2). Teachers who had attended workshops used study skills significantly ( $p < .0025$ ) more often than those teachers who had not attended workshops (Table 3).

---

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here

---

Elementary teachers used behavior management techniques significantly ( $p < .0000$ ) more often than middle and high school teachers (Table 4). High school teachers used parent volunteers significantly ( $p < .0472$ ) more often than did middle and elementary teachers (Table 5). Elementary school teachers used cooperative learning significantly ( $p < .0055$ ) more often than middle and high school teachers (Table 6).

---

Insert Tables 4, 5, and 6 about here

---

The year the last degree was received had only one significant result. Teachers who obtained their last degree before 1983 used cooperative learning significantly ( $p < .0408$ ) more often than those teachers who obtained their last degree in 1983 or after (Table 7).

---

Insert Table 7 about here

---

The following research questions were answered as follows:

1. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the attendance of workshops? This question was answered affirmatively. Educators who had attended workshops use curriculum modification ( $p < .0009$ ), cooperative learning ( $p < .0229$ ), and study skills ( $p < .0025$ ) significantly more often than educators who had not attended workshops.
2. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the grade level taught? This question was also answered affirmatively. Elementary teachers used behavior management ( $p < .0000$ ) techniques and cooperative learning ( $p < .0055$ ) significantly more often than middle and high school teachers. High school teachers used parent volunteers significantly ( $p < .0472$ ) more often than middle and elementary teachers.
3. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the amount of teaching experience? This question was answered negatively. No

significant difference was found based on the amount of teaching experience.

4. Will there be a significant difference in the use of one or more of the mainstreaming practices based on the year the last degree was obtained? This question was answered affirmatively. Teachers who obtained their last degree prior to 1983 used cooperative learning significantly ( $p < .0408$ ) more often than teachers who obtained their degrees during or after 1983.

#### Discussion

According to the results of the analyses, workshops were valuable in effectively implementing mainstreaming practices such as study skills, curriculum modification, and cooperative learning. Many school districts offer workshops for their educators as part of a staff development program. Results from this study suggested that many regular educators could benefit from attending workshops focusing on these three areas. There are many sources available for presenting these workshops. In addition to hiring outside consultants, teams of special and regular educators could be trained and then be

effectively used to present workshops for their fellow educators.

Results indicated that high school teachers used behavior management techniques much less often than elementary and middle school teachers. The age difference between these three levels could account for this discrepancy. The older students get, the less they want "public praise" and tangible reinforcers, both of which are associated with the behavior management techniques (Schumaker & Deshler, 1988).

Elementary teachers used cooperative learning more often than middle and high school teachers. Since elementary teachers tend to use student-centered instruction more often than middle and high school teachers, they are more likely to use cooperative learning which fits well in this instructional format.

Results suggested that high school teachers use parent volunteers more often than middle and elementary teachers. Many school districts offer career awareness for their high school students. Several parents take this opportunity to volunteer their services in the classroom. While elementary and middle teachers may use community volunteers, they may not necessarily include parents. Also, elementary teachers often use parent volunteers outside the classroom.

Findings suggested that teachers who obtained their degrees prior to 1983 used cooperative learning more often than teachers who received their degrees during or after 1983. One explanation could be that cooperative learning was not included in the preservice education these regular educators received while inservice teachers could take advantage of workshops in cooperative learning.

Two implications for teacher training were identified by this study. Individuals preparing to become teachers could benefit from the development of competencies in curriculum modification, cooperative learning, and study skills. Similarly, practicing teachers could benefit from inservice workshops in these same three areas. Such workshops provide an opportunity for updating teacher competencies.

Many children with learning/behavior problems can be served effectively in the regular classroom. This study found that curriculum modification, cooperative learning, study skills, behavior management techniques, and parent volunteers are being used by regular educators to facilitate the mainstreaming of students with learning/behavior problems. These findings support the promise of some aspects of the Regular

Education Initiative proposed by Will (1986) and  
others.



## References

- Allan, J. (1982). Preparation for mainstreaming: A new role for counselors. Guidance and Counseling, 16, 193-201.
- Asselin, S. (1983). Peer tutoring inservice program: Effects on home economics teachers' knowledge and attitudes. Home Economics Research Journal, 11, 350-358.
- Bloom, B. (1984). The 2 sigma problem: The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. Educational Researcher, 13, 4-16.
- Borg, W. & Gall, M. (1989). Educational research: An introduction, 5th ed. New York: Longman.
- Bryan, T., Bay, M., & Donahue, M. (1988). Implications of the learning disabilities definition for the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 23-28.
- Cassidy, J.W. (1990). Managing the mainstreamed classroom. Music Educators Journal, 76, 40-43.
- Coleman, M. & Gilliam, J. (1983). Disturbing behaviors in the classroom: A survey of teacher attitudes. The Journal of Special Education, 17, 121-129.
- Darrow, A.A. (1990). Beyond mainstreaming: Dealing with diversity. Music Educators Journal, 76, 36-39.

- Davis, W.B. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. Exceptional Children, 55, 440-446.
- Gans, K. (1987). Willingness of regular and special educators to teach students with handicaps. Exceptional Children, 54, 41-45.
- Guskey, T. (1984). Implementing mastery learning. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Hallahan, D.P., Keller, C.E., McKinney, J.D., Lloyd, J.W., & Bryan, T. (1988). Examining the research base of the regular education initiative: Efficacy studies and the adaptive learning environments model. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 29-35, 55.
- Hock, M., Hasazi, S.B., & Patton, A. (1990). Collaboration for learning: Strategies for program success. Music Educators Journal, 76, 44-48.
- Hutchinson, T. & Haring, N. (1982). Serving exceptional individuals. Theory Into Practice, 21, 82-87.
- Jenkins, J. & Jenkins, L. (1981). Cross age and peer tutoring: Help for children with learning problems. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

- Jenkins, J. & Jenkins, L. (1985). Peer tutoring in elementary and secondary programs. Focus on Exceptional Children, 17, 1-12.
- Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1984). Classroom learning structure and attitudes toward handicapped students in mainstream settings. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), Attitude and attitude change in special education (pp. 1-20). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M.M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 6-11.
- Keogh, B.K. (1988). Improving services for problem learners: Rethinking and restructuring. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 19-22.
- Knoff, H. (1985). Attitudes toward mainstreaming: A status report and comparison of regular and special educators in New York and Massachusetts. Psychology in the Schools, 22, 410-418.
- Kunzweiler, C. (1982). Mainstreaming will fail unless there is a change in professional attitude and institutional structure. Education, 102, 284-288.

- Larrivee, B. (1981). Effect of inservice training intensity on teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. *Exceptional Children*, 48, 34-39.
- Larrivee, B. & Cook, L. (1979). Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitude. *Journal of Special Education*, 13, 315-324.
- Leyser, Y. & Abrams, P. (1984). Changing attitudes of classroom teachers toward mainstreaming through in-service training. *Clearing House*, 57, 250-255.
- Lombrana, J. (1980). Fostering positive attitudes toward handicapped students: A guidance challenge. *The School Counselor*, 27, 176-183.
- Lombardi, T., Meadowcraft, P., & Strasburger, R. (1982). Modifying teacher trainers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. *Exceptional Children*, 48, 544-545.
- Martin, D. (1986). Special education vs. regular education: Bridging the cultural gap. *Clearing House*, 59, 259-262.
- Mason, J. (1985). Using special students as a resource. *Vocational Education Journal*, 60, 46-48.
- McDaniel, L. (1982). Changing vocational teachers' attitudes toward the handicapped. *Exceptional Children*, 48, 377-378.
- McKinney, J.D. & Hocutt, A.M. (1988). The need for policy analysis in evaluating the regular education

- initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 12-18.
- O'Brien, T. (1985). Helping handicapped students succeed. Vocational Education Journal, 60, 48.
- Reisburg, L. & Wolf, R. (1986). Developing a consulting program in special education: Implementation and interventions. Focus on Exceptional Children, 19, 1-14.
- Reisburg, L. & Wolf, R. (1988). Instructional strategies for special education consultants. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 29-40, 47.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (1979). Mainstreaming: Implementing the spirit of the law. Journal of Negro Education, 48, 364-381.
- Sarkees, M. & Sullivan, R. (1985). Tips for VSO advisers. Vocational Education Journal, 60, 43-46.
- Schmelkin, L. (1981). Teachers' and nonteachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Exceptional Children, 48, 42-47.
- Schumaker, J.B. & Deshler, D.D. (1988). Implementing the regular education initiative in secondary schools: A different ballgame. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 36-41.

- Sesow, D. & Adams, G. (1982). Future teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. Education, 102, 280-283.
- Slavin, R., Sharan, S., Kagan, S., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Webb, C., & Schmuck, R. (Eds.). (1985). Learning to cooperate cooperating to learn. New York: Plenum Press.
- Solomon, E.L. (1977). New York city's prototype school for educating the handicapped. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 7-10.
- Trent, S. (1989). "Much to do about nothing": A clarification of issues on the regular education initiative. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22, 23-25, 45.
- Warger, C. & Tripe, M. (1982). Preservice teacher attitudes toward mainstreamed students with emotional impairments. Exceptional Children, 49, 246-251.
- Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1985). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, Inc.
- Will, M.C. (1986). Educating students with learning problems--A shared responsibility. A report to the secretary. Washington, D.C.
- Wood, J. & Seyfarth, J. (1985). A study of teacher inservice training and changing teacher attitudes

toward handicapped children. Action in Teacher  
Education, 7, 65-71.

## TABLES



Table 1

Frequency of Use of Curriculum Modification Based on  
Workshop Attendance

	<u>Workshop Attendance</u>	
	yes	no
Use with learners		
<u>mainstreamed</u>		
<u>Rarely used</u>	6	27
Used with less	11	32
<u>than half</u>		
Used with more	25	23
<u>than half</u>		
Used with	23	20
<u>almost all</u>		

$(3, N=167)=12.84, p<.0009$

Table 2

Frequency of Use of Cooperative Learning Based on  
Workshop Attendance

	<u>Workshop Attendance</u>	
	yes	no
Use with learners		
<u>mainstreamed</u>		
<u>Rarely used</u>	13	40
<u>Used with less</u>	17	29
<u>than half</u>		
<u>Used with more</u>	18	19
<u>than half</u>		
<u>Used with</u>	18	15
<u>almost all</u>		

$(3, N=169)=12.88, p<.0229$

Table 3

Frequency of Use of Study Skills Based on Workshop Attendance

	<u>Workshop Attendance</u>	
	yes	no
Use with learners mainstreamed		
Rarely used	7	32
Used with less than half	16	33
Used with more than half	23	21
Used with almost all	20	18

$(3, N=170) = 14.75, p < .0025$

Table 4

Frequency of Use of Behavior Management Techniques  
Based on Grade Level Taught

	<u>Grade Level Taught</u>		
	1-4	5-8	9-12
Use with learners			
<u>mainstreamed</u>			
Rarely used	4	15	27
Used with less	9	14	17
<u>than half</u>			
Used with more	14	17	7
<u>than half</u>			
Used with	24	11	9
<u>almost all</u>			

$(6, N=168)=11.53, p<.0000$

Table 5

Frequency of Use of Parent Volunteers Based on Grade  
Level Taught

	<u>Grade Level Taught</u>		
	1-4	5-8	9-12
Use with learners mainstreamed			
Rarely used	40	51	53
Used with less than half	8	5	4
Used with more than half	3		
Used with almost all		1	3

$(6, N=168)=0.911, p<.0472$

Table 6

Frequency of Use of Cooperative Learning Based on Grade  
Level Taught

	<u>Grade Level Taught</u>		
	1-4	5-8	9-12
Use with learners			
<u>mainstreamed</u>			
Rarely used	12	13	25
Used with less	7	21	18
<u>than half</u>			
Used with more	16	14	8
<u>than half</u>			
Used with	15	9	8
<u>almost all</u>			

$(6, N=166)=9.63, p<.0055$

Table 7

Frequency of Use of Cooperative Learning Based on Year  
Last Degree was Obtained

	<u>Year Last Degree Obtained</u>		
	83-89	75-89	before 75
Use with learners mainstreamed			
Rarely used	12	11	31
Used with less than half	10	17	19
Used with more than half	5	21	13
Used with almost all	9	9	15

$(6, N=172)=6.90, p<.0408$

APPENDICES





Effective Practices Survey - Demographic Data - Section I

1. Are you currently working with or have you ever had a learner labeled as exceptional in your classroom (such as LD, EMH, BD)?  
(If you answer this question NO, please return the survey without answering any further questions)  
No..... 1 (5)  
Yes..... 2
2. Are you  
Male..... 1 (6)  
Female..... 2
3. Which age bracket are you in?  
22 or younger..... 1 (7)  
23-30..... 2  
31-40..... 3  
41-50..... 4  
51-60..... 5  
61+..... 6
4. Which best describes the student's age or grade that you presently teach?  
(grade 1-4)..... 1 (8)  
(grade 5-8)..... 2  
(grade 9-12)..... 3
5. Counting this year, how many years teaching experience do you have?  
(1-2)..... 1 (9)  
(3-5)..... 2  
(6-15)..... 3  
(16+)..... 4
6. What is the highest degree you have earned?  
(BS)..... 1 (10)  
(BS + 15)..... 2  
(M.S.)..... 3  
(M.S. + 30)..... 4  
(Ed. S. - education specialist)..... 5  
(Ed.D. or Ph.D.)..... 6
7. The year you obtained your last degree could best be described as:  
1989-1983..... 1 (11)  
1983-1975..... 2  
Before 1975..... 3
8. In your experience as a teacher, with how many students with special needs have you worked?  
None..... 1 (12)  
1-5..... 2  
6-10..... 3  
11-20..... 4  
More than 20..... 5
9. Are you certified for the level you are currently teaching?  
Yes..... 1 (13)  
No..... 2

10. Have you attended a workshop or workshops on successful mainstreaming practices?

Yes..... 1 (14)

No..... 2

## SECTION II

Instructions: Through the literature several practices have been identified that are most commonly used in mainstreaming a learner with a learning/behavior problem in the classroom. Please circle the number that reflects how often you use these practices.

1=rarely use, 2=use with less than half of learners mainstreamed, 3=use with more than half of learners mainstreamed, 4=use with almost all of learners mainstreamed

1. Peer tutoring (same age student tutors) 1 2 3 4 (15)

2. Cross-age tutoring (different age student tutors) 1 2 3 4 (16)

3. Curriculum modification (such as smaller work load, taking tests in resource room) 1 2 3 4 (17)

4. Behavior management techniques (such as token systems, assertive discipline, time out) 1 2 3 4 (18)

5. Task analysis (breaking learning activities into small steps) 1 2 3 4 (19)

6. Parent volunteers (supervising, reading to children, career awareness) 1 2 3 4 (20)

7. Mastery learning (students must achieve certain criteria before moving on) 1 2 3 4 (21)

8. Cooperative learning (structured heterogeneous grouping for instruction) 1 2 3 4 (22)

9. Study skills (teaching students how to study) 1 2 3 4 (23)